



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HARVARD LAW REVIEW.

Published monthly, during the Academic Year, by Harvard Law Students.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.50 PER ANNUM 35 CENTS PER NUMBER.

Editorial Board.

OLIVER PRESCOTT, JR.,	<i>Editor-in-Chief.</i>
PHILIP S. ABBOT, <i>Treasurer.</i>	RICHMOND O. AULICK,
ALBERT S. BARD,	ALBERT E. HADLOCK,
NORMAN HAPGOOD,	HENRY HUDSON,
CARLETON HUNNEMAN,	J. WRIGHT HUNT,
FREDERICK B. JACOBS,	M. DAY KIMBALL,
JAMES G. KING,	JAMES M. NEWELL,
PHILIP WARDNER,	CHARLES WARREN,

GEORGE E. WRIGHT.

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL — INCREASED NUMBER OF STUDENTS. — The astonishing increase in the membership of the Law School this year must be very gratifying, not only to the instructors as evidence of appreciation of their work, but to all who are interested in the school and its methods. The Dean especially must take great satisfaction in the prosperity of the school, and in the assured success and firm establishment of the method of instruction to which he has given so much thought and so many years of devoted effort. To be sure, it is not possible to say that the growing confidence in the Langdell method has been the sole cause of the increase of students in the present year: with our great increase we may readily admit that a portion of the growth is due entirely to accidental causes. Yet such increased confidence, warranted as it is by the success of recent graduates of the school, and spread through the profession, as we are glad to acknowledge, by the influence of the Harvard Law School Association, is believed to be the chief cause of the present numbers.

In view of the increase of this year, a few statistics and comparisons may not be uninteresting: —

While last year there were 160 new entries to the school during the entire year, this year, up to November 25, there have already been 205. Of this number, 57 are Harvard graduates, 73 are graduates of other colleges, and 75 are non-graduates. Not before since 1873, with possibly one exception, have the graduates of other colleges exceeded those of Harvard. This increase of graduates of other colleges is worthy of study. To the First Year class at this time last year Yale and Brown had together contributed 8 of their graduates, and Bowdoin none; to the First Year class of this year, those three colleges have given 34 men, Yale 18, and Brown and Bowdoin 8 each.

Of the 363 men now in the school, as against 279 at the same time last year, it is somewhat curious that the number of Special Students remains the same as last year, 61. The entire increase, therefore, appears in the regular classes. With regard to these Special Students, too, from the fact that 6 already hold the degree of LL. B. and 3 others are college graduates, it would seem pretty evident that many

are registered as they are for far other reasons than that of inability to pass the examinations necessary for entrance to the regular classes.

One other fact especially worthy of notice is that the present Second Year class is now larger than it was in its first year, numbering 112 this year as against 101 last year. This is something which has never happened before, at least since the present system of examinations began, and in itself alone is something rather remarkable. The natural tendency, of course, is that a class in the Law School, like a class in college, should steadily diminish in numbers from its first to its last year. But in this instance it is gratifying to see that the number of men who fell out at the end of the first year was so small that it could, even without reckoning the few who for various reasons had failed to receive promotion to the present Third Year class, be more than replaced by the number entering to advanced standing.

The following list shows the number of students as they appeared in the Catalogue of 1890-91, and as they will appear in that of 1891-92:—

1890-91.		1891-92.	
Third Year	44	Third Year	48
Second Year	73	Second Year	112
First Year	101	First Year	142
Special Students	61	Special Students	61
<hr/>		<hr/>	
Total	279	Total	363

JUDICIAL GRAMMAR.—The REVIEW is indebted to the Chief Justice of Montana, Hon. Henry N. Blake, for an exhaustive research (the substance of which is given below) into the usages of the bench, both in this country and in England, in regard to the use of number (*i. e.*, whether singular or plural) in terms which are necessarily employed with great frequency in instructions or opinions. The subject is one, as the Chief Justice remarks, of form rather than substance, the use of incorrect grammar not being material from a legal point of view. Sir Edward Coke, in the preface to his Commentaries upon Littleton, says: "In school divinity, and amongst the glossographers and interpreters of the civil and canon laws, in logick, and in the liberal sciences, you shall meet with a whole army of words, which cannot defend themselves *in bello grammaticali*, in the grammatical war . . ." It is probably to meet the confusion arising *ex bello grammaticali* that the canon of interpretation was established, that statutory expressions in the singular number shall be deemed to include the plural, and *vice versa*. The question is, shall we say, "the majority of the court are," or "the majority is," "the court are," or "the court is," "the jury are," or "the jury is," etc., etc.? The Chief Justice finds a great diversity among the members of the bench in the use of these terms. After citing a very large number of authorities, he comes to the conclusion that the highest number of jurists has sanctioned the use of the expressions "the majority are," "the court is," "the jury are." Why the distinction should be made between the jury and the court, except in the case of a single judge, it is difficult to imagine. It probably arises from the fact that the court, though really composed of several individuals, is (or are) vulgarly looked upon as an awful entity; whereas it is always difficult to remember that the jury are not "twelve men good